

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,566	09/12/2000	William G. Deitz	SJ09-2000-0087US1 6955	
7:	590 03/11/2005	EXAMINER		
Randall J Blue	****	LEE, CHI HO A		
IBM Corporation Intellectual Pro		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
5600 Cottle Ro	ad L2PA 0142	2663		
San Jose, CA	95193	DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/660,56	6	DEITZ ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
		Andrew L	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2663	L		
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this commun r Reply	ication appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress		
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN sions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 period for reply is specified above, the maximum st e to reply within the set or extended period for reply eply received by the Office later than three months d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evenunication. O) days, a reply within the state attutory period will apply and with will. by statute. cause the apply and with a will.	ent, however, may a reply be time story minimum of thirty (30) days Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONEI	ely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this co	y. ommunication.		
Status							
1)[]	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 27 October 200	<u>4</u> .				
<i>'</i> —							
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected. 						
Application	on Papers						
9) 🗌 -	The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.					
10) 🔲 -	0) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment			A) D Intention Summer	(DTO 442)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) A) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		O-152)		

Art Unit: 2663

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 6 should depend on Claim 3 and not Claim 1 because Claim 1 does not require a first and second resiliency circuit. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 15, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hahn et al U.S. Patent Number 5,991,891.

Re Claims 1, 9, 18, 19, fig. 5 teaches loop system 100 (adaptive hub) including loops (first and second loops) coupled to nodes 102 and 104 (a first and second host server interface terminals respectively) and MUX switch 124 (a loop healing switch) coupled to the loops to heal loop failure (See col. 5, lines 13-43).

Re Claims 2, 11, refer to Claim 1, nodes 102 and 104 includes loop coherency circuits (a first and second storage controller terminals).

Re Claims 3, 6, 12, 15, refer to Claim 2, wherein a loop coherency circuits of node 130 includes a pair of loop redundancy chips 126 (a first and second loop

Art Unit: 2663

resiliency circuits; a third and fourth loop resiliency circuit) coupled between loops and nodes 102 and 104 (See col. 2, lines 59-64).

Re Claim 10, refer to Claim 9, storage controllers are RAID (See col. 5, lines 45-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn et al U.S. Patent Number 5,991,891 in view of Henson et al U.S. Patent Number 6,289,002.

Re Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 20, 21, refer to Claim 3, wherein within the 126 includes MUX (a port bypass circuit) for switching from primary loop to secondary loop when a loop failure is detected (See col. 4, lines 12-20), wherein the loop coherency circuit (a signal detection unit; a first logic) look for signal levels determine incoherency or failure to enable connect and disconnect of loops (See col. 3, lines 55 ~ col. 4, lines 1-10). Hahn fails to explicitly teach checking for "a loop port enable signal from a controller...indicates there is a fault in the controller". However, Henson teaches in fig. 3, a Hub port receive-circuit 314 that receives a loop initiation failure data (a loop port enable signal) from a Node 310 (a controller) to enable a bypass control for the loops coupled to the MUX 306 (See col. 6, lines 33-60). As Hahn et al monitors for physical

Art Unit: 2663

loop failure, one skilled in art would have been motivated by Henson to also monitor for nodal failure for reliability. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled to combine the teaching of Henson into the teaching of Hahn.

6. Claims 7, 16, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn et al U.S. Patent Number 5,991,891.

Re Claims 7, 16, 23, Hahn fails to explicitly teach "a copper fibre channel hub". Examiner take official notice that the FCAL standard support copper media and loops. Hence, one skilled in the art would have motivated to use a copper media as supported the FCAL specification.

7. Claims 8, 17, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn et al U.S. Patent Number 5,991,891.

Re Claims 8, 17, 22, in fig. 5, the node 130 coupled to the loops inherently operates a prescribed bandwidth. When a single loop is coupled to the 130, the loop rate is match with the host bandwidth. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to set the node bandwidth twice the bandwidth of the host when two loops are coupled together for rate matching, as long as the loop rates are the same.

Response to Arguments

- 8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-3130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30AM to 6:00PM.

Art Unit: 2663

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AI 3/5/05